

Message

---

**From:** Hamilton, Lindsay [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BC6BC5ADBF134E70AC4E553B3B04DF36-HAMILTON, L]  
**Sent:** 12/21/2021 12:38:04 AM  
**To:** Grantham, Nancy [Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov]  
**CC:** Dunton, Cheryl [Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov]; Conger, Nick [Conger.Nick@epa.gov]; Daguillard, Robert [Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov]; Carroll, Timothy [Carroll.Timothy@epa.gov]  
**Subject:** Re: Next whistleblower piece

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP) I will send in ten minutes.

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 20, 2021, at 7:28 PM, Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov> wrote:

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP) thanks ng

Nancy Grantham  
Principal Deputy Associate Administrator  
Environmental Protection Agency  
Office of Public Affairs  
202-564-6879 (desk)  
202-253-7056 (cell)  
[grantham.nancy@epa.gov](mailto:grantham.nancy@epa.gov)

---

**From:** Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 20, 2021 7:26 PM  
**To:** Hamilton, Lindsay <Hamilton.Lindsay@epa.gov>; Conger, Nick <Conger.Nick@epa.gov>; Daguillard, Robert <Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>; Carroll, Timothy <Carroll.Timothy@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Next whistleblower piece

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

---

**From:** Hamilton, Lindsay <[Hamilton.Lindsay@epa.gov](mailto:Hamilton.Lindsay@epa.gov)>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 20, 2021 6:42 PM  
**To:** Conger, Nick <[Conger.Nick@epa.gov](mailto:Conger.Nick@epa.gov)>; Daguillard, Robert <[Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov](mailto:Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** Grantham, Nancy <[Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov](mailto:Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov)>; Dunton, Cheryl <[Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov](mailto:Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov)>; Carroll, Timothy <[Carroll.Timothy@epa.gov](mailto:Carroll.Timothy@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Next whistleblower piece

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

---

**From:** Conger, Nick <[Conger.Nick@epa.gov](mailto:Conger.Nick@epa.gov)>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 20, 2021 6:26 PM  
**To:** Daguillard, Robert <[Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov](mailto:Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** Grantham, Nancy <[Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov](mailto:Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov)>; Dunton, Cheryl <[Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov](mailto:Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov)>; Hamilton, Lindsay <[Hamilton.Lindsay@epa.gov](mailto:Hamilton.Lindsay@epa.gov)>; Carroll, Timothy <[Carroll.Timothy@epa.gov](mailto:Carroll.Timothy@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** Re: Next whistleblower piece

### **Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)**

Nick Conger  
EPA Press Secretary  
202-941-1116

On Dec 20, 2021, at 6:25 PM, Daguillard, Robert <[Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov](mailto:Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov)> wrote:

Yes, I shall.

---

**From:** Grantham, Nancy <[Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov](mailto:Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov)>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 20, 2021 6:18 PM  
**To:** Dunton, Cheryl <[Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov](mailto:Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** Hamilton, Lindsay <[Hamilton.Lindsay@epa.gov](mailto:Hamilton.Lindsay@epa.gov)>; Daguillard, Robert <[Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov](mailto:Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov)>; Conger, Nick <[Conger.Nick@epa.gov](mailto:Conger.Nick@epa.gov)>; Carroll, Timothy <[Carroll.Timothy@epa.gov](mailto:Carroll.Timothy@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Next whistleblower piece

### **Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)**

Nancy Grantham  
Principal Deputy Associate Administrator  
Environmental Protection Agency  
Office of Public Affairs  
202-564-6879 (desk)  
202-253-7056 (cell)  
[grantham.nancy@epa.gov](mailto:grantham.nancy@epa.gov)

---

**From:** Dunton, Cheryl <[Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov](mailto:Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov)>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 20, 2021 4:20 PM  
**To:** Grantham, Nancy <[Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov](mailto:Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** Hamilton, Lindsay <[Hamilton.Lindsay@epa.gov](mailto:Hamilton.Lindsay@epa.gov)>; Daguillard, Robert <[Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov](mailto:Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov)>; Conger, Nick <[Conger.Nick@epa.gov](mailto:Conger.Nick@epa.gov)>; Carroll, Timothy <[Carroll.Timothy@epa.gov](mailto:Carroll.Timothy@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Next whistleblower piece

### **Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)**

---

**From:** Dunton, Cheryl  
**Sent:** Monday, December 20, 2021 2:07 PM  
**To:** Grantham, Nancy <[Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov](mailto:Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** Hamilton, Lindsay <[Hamilton.Lindsay@epa.gov](mailto:Hamilton.Lindsay@epa.gov)>; Daguillard, Robert <[Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov](mailto:Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov)>; Conger, Nick <[Conger.Nick@epa.gov](mailto:Conger.Nick@epa.gov)>; Carroll, Timothy <[Carroll.Timothy@epa.gov](mailto:Carroll.Timothy@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** Re: Next whistleblower piece

I've got a response with Michal that she's reviewing

On Dec 20, 2021, at 2:06 PM, Grantham, Nancy  
<[Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov](mailto:Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov)> wrote:

**Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)** thanks ng

Nancy Grantham  
Principal Deputy Associate Administrator  
Environmental Protection Agency  
Office of Public Affairs  
202-564-6879 (desk)  
202-253-7056 (cell)  
[grantham.nancy@epa.gov](mailto:grantham.nancy@epa.gov)

---

**From:** Hamilton, Lindsay <[Hamilton.Lindsay@epa.gov](mailto:Hamilton.Lindsay@epa.gov)>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 20, 2021 2:04 PM  
**To:** Daguillard, Robert <[Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov](mailto:Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov)>; Grantham, Nancy <[Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov](mailto:Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** Conger, Nick <[Conger.Nick@epa.gov](mailto:Conger.Nick@epa.gov)>; Carroll, Timothy <[Carroll.Timothy@epa.gov](mailto:Carroll.Timothy@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** FW: Next whistleblower piece

**Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)**

---

**From:** Sharon Lerner <[sharon.lerner@theintercept.com](mailto:sharon.lerner@theintercept.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 20, 2021 11:37 AM  
**To:** Daguillard, Robert <[Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov](mailto:Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** Carroll, Timothy <[Carroll.Timothy@epa.gov](mailto:Carroll.Timothy@epa.gov)>; Hamilton, Lindsay <[Hamilton.Lindsay@epa.gov](mailto:Hamilton.Lindsay@epa.gov)>; Dunton, Cheryl <[Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov](mailto:Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** Re: Next whistleblower piece

Yes confirming that we can update at any point after publication.  
Sharon Lerner  
Investigative Reporter  
The Intercept  
mobile/signal 718-877-5236  
[@fastlerner](mailto:@fastlerner)  
<https://theintercept.com/staff/sharonlerner/>

PGP:  
CB29 D9FF 9285 3205 087E 83A1 0C30 2F39 4F30 8BFE

On Dec 20, 2021, at 11:35 AM, Sharon Lerner  
<[sharon.lerner@theintercept.com](mailto:sharon.lerner@theintercept.com)> wrote:

We can update at any point, I believe. I put in a note to my editor to confirm, will let you know as soon as he gets back to me.

Sharon Lerner  
Investigative Reporter  
The Intercept  
mobile/signal 718-877-5236  
@fastlerner  
<https://theintercept.com/staff/sharonlerner/>

PGP:  
CB29 D9FF 9285 3205 087E 83A1 0C30 2F39 4F30 8BFE

On Dec 20, 2021, at 11:27 AM,  
Daguillard, Robert  
<[Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov](mailto:Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov)> wrote:

Thanks, Sharon. Duly noted. How late can you update your story?

---

**From:** Sharon Lerner  
<[sharon.lerner@theintercept.com](mailto:sharon.lerner@theintercept.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 20, 2021  
11:24 AM  
**To:** Daguillard, Robert  
<[Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov](mailto:Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** Carroll, Timothy  
<[Carroll.Timothy@epa.gov](mailto:Carroll.Timothy@epa.gov)>; Hamilton,  
Lindsay <[Hamilton.Lindsay@epa.gov](mailto:Hamilton.Lindsay@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** Re: Next whistleblower piece

Robert-  
This is going to come out tomorrow. So sorry for the shorter than usual turnaround time

Sharon Lerner  
Investigative Reporter  
The Intercept  
mobile/signal 718-877-5236  
@fastlerner  
<https://theintercept.com/staff/sharonlerner/>

PGP:  
CB29 D9FF 9285 3205 087E 83A1 0C30  
2F39 4F30 8BFE

On Dec 20, 2021, at  
9:08 AM, Daguillard,  
Robert  
<[Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov](mailto:Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov)> wrote:

Sorry, Sharon: I'm sure you realize this week will see lighter-than-usual staffing: We're closed Friday, to say nothing of staff going on leave beforehand. Are you planning to put this piece out any time before, say, the first of the year? How urgently do you need it?

Thanks as always, R.

---

**From:** Daguillard,  
Robert  
<[Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov](mailto:Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov)>

**Sent:** Monday,  
December 20, 2021  
9:04 AM

**To:** Sharon Lerner  
<[sharon.lerner@theintercept.com](mailto:sharon.lerner@theintercept.com)>

**Cc:** Carroll, Timothy  
<[Carroll.Timothy@epa.gov](mailto:Carroll.Timothy@epa.gov)>; Hamilton, Lindsay  
<[Hamilton.Lindsay@epa.gov](mailto:Hamilton.Lindsay@epa.gov)>; EPA Press Office  
<[Press@epa.gov](mailto:Press@epa.gov)>

**Subject:** RE: Next  
whistleblower piece

Good morning  
Sharon,

I know your message is addressed to Tim and Lindsay, but I wanted to acknowledge on their behalf.

Best as always, R.

---

**From:** Sharon Lerner  
<[sharon.lerner@theintercept.com](mailto:sharon.lerner@theintercept.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday,  
December 20, 2021  
8:53 AM  
**To:** EPA Press Office  
<[Press@epa.gov](mailto:Press@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** Carroll, Timothy  
<[Carroll.Timothy@epa.gov](mailto:Carroll.Timothy@epa.gov)>; Hamilton, Lindsay  
<[Hamilton.Lindsay@epa.gov](mailto:Hamilton.Lindsay@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** Re: Next  
whistleblower piece

Hi Tim and Lindsay-  
Just circling back on this  
to make sure you  
received it.  
Thanks,  
Sharon

Sharon Lerner  
Investigative Reporter  
The Intercept  
mobile/signal 718-877-  
5236  
[@fastlerner](mailto:@fastlerner)  
[https://theintercept.com/  
staff/sharonlerner/](https://theintercept.com/staff/sharonlerner/)

PGP:  
CB29 D9FF 9285 3205  
087E 83A1 0C30 2F39  
4F30 8BFE

On Dec  
17,  
2021,  
at  
10:19  
AM,  
Sharon  
Lerner  
<[sharon.lerner@theintercept.com](mailto:sharon.lerner@theintercept.com)>  
wrote:

Hi Tim  
and the

press  
office-

I am  
writing  
with  
questio  
ns  
regardi  
ng the  
next  
article  
in the  
series  
based  
on the  
EPA  
whistle  
blowers  
. I am  
basing  
the  
piece,  
which  
I've  
summa  
rized  
below,  
on  
interviews with  
several  
EPA  
employees as  
well as  
documents  
they  
have  
shared  
with  
me,  
including  
screens  
hots of  
emails.  
I am  
asking  
whether  
you  
want to

comme  
nt on  
any of  
what  
I've  
written  
below  
and  
have  
highligh  
ted in  
yellow  
three  
questio  
ns.  
Can you  
please  
get me  
your  
respons  
e by  
the end  
of the  
day on  
Monda  
y?  
Thank  
you,  
Sharon

++++

In this  
piece, I  
write  
about  
the  
assess  
ment of  
a paint  
product  
that  
was  
finalize  
d on  
Decem  
ber 19,  
2019.  
The  
paint  
contain  
ed the  
solvent



parachlorobenzotrifluoride, or PCBTF, which made up half of the product by weight. PCBTF presents numerous health hazards, according to a 2009 report from the National Toxicology Program. Earlier in 2019, California had listed PCBTF under Proposition 65, basing its decision on evidence that the chemical had caused liver tumors

in both  
male  
and  
female  
mice.  
And  
just  
month  
before  
the  
produc  
t was  
being  
assesse  
d by  
EPA's  
NCD,  
the  
Intern  
ational  
Agency  
for  
Cancer  
Resear  
ch  
had de  
emed  
PCBTF  
a likely  
human  
carcino  
gen.

The  
toxicol  
ogist  
who  
was  
assigne  
d the  
case of  
the  
paint  
noted  
that it  
contai  
ned  
PCBTF  
and en  
gaged  
in  
conver  
sations  
- in  
person  
and  
over

email -  
about  
how to  
handle  
it.  
While  
numer  
ous  
assesso  
rs  
agreed  
that  
the  
risks of  
PCBTF  
should  
be  
include  
d in  
the  
assess  
ment  
of the  
new  
paint,  
one off  
icial,  
who  
holds a  
senior  
leaders  
hip  
role in  
the  
agency  
, said  
she felt  
that  
the  
danger  
s of  
PCBTF  
should  
not be  
mentio  
ned in  
the  
assess  
ment.  
In a  
Decem  
ber 18  
email,  
she  
describ  
ed the  
chemic

al as  
“just a  
solvent  
there  
as a  
part of  
makin  
g it.”  
She  
argued  
that, b  
ecause  
it  
didn’t  
appear  
that  
PCBTF  
was  
meant  
to be  
an  
ingredi  
ent in  
the  
final  
produc  
t, its  
health  
effects  
should  
not be  
consid  
ered in  
the  
assess  
ment.

The  
official  
, whom  
the whi  
stleblo  
wers  
asked  
me not  
to  
name  
in the  
piece,  
also  
pointe  
d the  
assesso  
rs to a  
1985  
memo,  
which

addressed when EPA should assess the risk from a new chemical substance. The whistleblower describes her as angrily throwing the memo at them and said that tensions with this official over identifying chemicals' risks were running high.

The official saw the memo as evidence that PCBTF should n't be considered

when  
assessing the  
paint  
and  
told  
the  
toxicologists  
assembled at  
the  
meeting to  
“Read  
it.  
Follow  
it.” But  
several  
of the  
assessors  
interpreted  
the  
memo  
differently,  
pointing out  
that  
some  
sections  
seemed to  
support the  
inclusion of  
PCBTF  
in the  
assessment  
and  
noting  
that  
others  
laid  
out the  
possibility of  
referring the  
compound to  
the

Existin  
g  
Chemi  
cals  
progra  
m for  
assess  
ment.  
The  
memo  
also  
laid  
out  
other  
actions  
to be  
taken  
if the  
new  
chemic  
als  
divisio  
n did  
not  
assess  
the  
produc  
t.  
"There'  
s a  
final  
paragr  
aph  
stating  
that if  
there is  
nothin  
g done,  
if we're  
not  
going  
to do  
the  
review  
ourselv  
es, at a  
bare  
minim  
um,  
the  
risk  
manag  
ers  
should  
be  
comm  
unicati

ng  
what  
we  
found  
to the  
chemic  
al  
compa  
ny so  
that  
they  
know  
that  
they  
have to  
take  
some  
sort of  
action,  
" one  
of five  
agency  
scienti  
sts  
who ex  
presse  
d their  
suppor  
t for  
includi  
ng the  
danger  
s of  
PCBTF  
in the  
assess  
ment  
of the  
new  
paint  
said.  
This  
did not  
happe  
n,  
accordi  
ng to  
the  
whistle  
blower  
s.  
"It  
does  
seem  
that we  
need to  
be



concerned about the risk of the new chemical plus existing chemicals that pose risk," another of the toxicologists wrote. "I think the human health assessors need to feel comfortable that we are doing our best to protect public health."

Another concurred, noting that "several of us spoke to NCMB [New Chemicals Management Branch] in

mid-  
Octobe  
r about  
this  
and  
they  
suppor  
ted  
assessi  
ng  
residua  
ls,  
impuri  
ties”  
for risk  
assess  
ments.

But the  
hazard  
s  
presen  
ted by  
PCBTF  
were  
not  
include  
d in  
the  
assess  
ment  
of the  
paint. I  
n a  
version  
of the  
docum  
ent  
entere  
d into  
the  
divisio  
n’s  
compu  
ter  
system  
on  
Decem  
ber 17,  
the  
toxicol  
ogist  
had  
noted  
that  
PCBTF  
can be

absorb  
ed  
throug  
h the  
lungs,  
GI  
tract,  
and  
skin.  
He  
also  
identifi  
ed  
cancer  
as one  
of its  
hazard  
s,  
along  
with  
liver,  
kidney,  
lung,  
and  
adrena  
l gland  
effects,  
and  
calcula  
ted the  
cancer  
risk  
associa  
ted  
with  
precise  
amoun  
ts of  
the  
paint.  
But the  
next  
day,  
hours  
after  
the  
conten  
tious  
meetin  
g at  
which  
the  
memo  
was  
discuss  
ed, the  
official

who  
had  
argued  
against  
the  
inclusion  
of  
the  
information  
inserted a  
note  
into  
the  
assessment,  
asking  
him to  
delete  
all  
references to  
PCBTF

.  
The  
toxicologist  
did not  
delete  
the  
information,  
but the  
official  
who  
had led  
the  
charge  
against  
making any  
mention of  
the  
risks of  
PCBTF  
did.  
On  
December 18,  
she  
posted  
an  
updated  
version

of the  
assess  
ment  
that  
crosse  
d out  
the list  
of  
PCBT's  
effects  
and  
the  
exposu  
re  
levels  
above  
which  
it  
could  
be  
expect  
ed to  
cause  
cancer.  
In its  
place,  
she  
inserte  
d a  
new  
senten  
ce:  
"For  
the  
new  
chemic  
al  
substa  
nce  
(polym  
er),  
EPA  
did not  
identif  
y a  
hazard  
." The  
next  
day,  
she  
signed  
off on  
the  
docum  
ent she  
had  
change

d,  
publicl  
y  
declari  
ng that  
the  
agency  
had  
found  
that it  
did not  
pose a  
hazard

.  
The  
whistle  
blower  
s said  
that  
the  
remov  
al of  
the  
scientif  
ically  
accurat  
e  
warnin  
g left  
the  
scienti  
sts  
who do  
chemic  
al  
assess  
ments  
feeling  
powerl  
ess to  
do  
their  
jobs —  
and  
win an  
argum  
ent  
within  
their  
workpl  
ace on  
its  
merits.  
“You’v  
e got  
multipl  
e

people  
saying,  
hey,  
this  
deserv  
es  
more  
careful  
consid  
eration  
. But  
she  
made a  
call,  
overro  
de  
everyb  
ody,  
shut it  
down,  
and we  
never  
talked  
about  
it  
again,”  
said  
one.  
The  
whistle  
blower  
said  
that  
EPA  
could  
have  
taken  
several  
possibl  
e  
actions  
to alert  
the  
public  
about  
the  
paint.  
“But  
the  
conver  
sation  
is not  
‘what  
can we  
do  
within  
these

limitati  
ons?"  
he  
said.  
"Instea  
d their  
questio  
n is,  
'how  
little  
can we  
get  
away  
with?  
What  
can we  
get off  
our  
plate?'  
"

He  
also  
said  
that  
"When  
new  
inform  
ation  
comes  
in that  
shows  
that  
someth  
ing is  
less  
toxic  
than  
what  
we  
though  
t, that  
gets  
used  
right  
away.  
But if  
it  
shows  
that  
there  
are  
new  
concer  
ns that  
we  
weren't  
aware



of  
before,  
sudden  
ly the  
level of  
scrutin  
y goes  
way  
up.”  
I asked  
David  
Michael  
s, the  
former  
head of  
OSHA,  
about  
this  
case,  
which  
involve  
s the  
potenti  
al  
exposur  
e to  
worker  
s. And  
he  
said “T  
he EPA  
is  
suppos  
ed to  
be  
consid  
ering  
whethe  
r  
worker  
s’  
exposu  
res  
could  
be  
toxic.  
This is  
a  
failure  
of EPA  
to  
follow  
the  
law.”  
I note  
in the

story  
that  
the  
whistle  
blower  
s are  
not  
allowe  
d to  
disclos  
e the  
produc  
ts  
name  
or  
anythi  
ng else  
about  
it  
becaus  
e, as is  
almost  
always  
the  
case,  
the  
manuf  
acturer  
s  
submit  
ted  
those  
details  
to the  
agency  
as  
confide  
ntial  
busine  
ss  
inform  
ation.  
[QUES  
TION:  
IS  
THIS  
ACCU  
RATE,  
THAT  
MANU  
FACT  
URER  
S “AL  
MOST  
ALWA  
YS”  
SUBM

IT  
THE  
INFOR  
MATI  
ON  
ABOU  
T  
THEIR  
PROD  
UCTS  
IN  
PMNS  
AS  
CBI?  
OR IS  
IT  
ALWA  
YS  
THE  
CASE?  
OR  
JUST  
SOME  
TIMES  
?]

I note  
that  
the  
staffers  
could  
face  
penalti  
es if  
they  
disclos  
ed  
them  
and  
that  
they  
can  
identif  
y  
PCBTF  
withou  
t  
penalt  
y  
becaus  
e, as an  
existin  
g  
chemic  
al, it is  
not  
subject  
to the

same  
restrict  
ions.  
I note  
that  
the  
paint is  
not the  
only  
produc  
t that  
contai  
ns  
PCBTF  
and  
that  
none  
of 7  
safety  
data  
sheets  
I found  
for  
produc  
ts that  
contai  
n it  
identifi  
ed the  
risk of  
cancer.  
I also  
note  
that  
there  
are  
many  
chemic  
als for  
which  
the  
EPA  
has  
failed  
to  
update  
regulat  
ion  
based  
on the  
most  
recent  
science  
.  
“We  
never  
go

back  
and  
review  
these  
cases  
and  
put on  
new  
restrict  
ions  
for  
their  
use,”  
said  
one of  
the  
whistle  
blower  
s.

I note  
that  
the  
EPA  
chose  
20 “high  
priority” subs  
tances  
to be  
evaluat  
ed  
under  
the  
update  
d  
chemic  
als law  
in  
2019.

[QUES  
TION:  
WHEN  
ARE  
THOS  
E 20  
ASSES  
SMEN  
TS  
EXPEC  
TED  
TO BE  
FINAL  
IZED?]

I also  
note

that there is no clear way to ensure that the agency updates its assessments — or even informs anyone —

when it learns about the harms of a chemical and refer back to my recent story on 8e submission

s.  
[QUESTION: IS THERE ANY UPDATE ON THIS? ARE THE 8ES AVAILABLE YET IN CHEMVIEW?]

Finally, I note that the whistle

blowers  
found  
experie  
nce of  
being u  
nable  
to pers  
uade  
their  
superi  
or of  
the  
import  
ance of  
warnin  
g the  
public  
about  
PCBTF  
both  
frustra  
ting  
and  
bafflin  
g.  
“Why  
would  
someo  
ne  
hear  
that  
there's  
a  
cancer  
risk for  
worker  
s and  
not  
even  
let  
people  
know  
about  
it?” On  
e asked  
. “Why  
would  
they  
think  
that  
that's  
someth  
ing  
that  
can  
just be

ignore  
d?"

Sharon  
Lerner  
Investig  
ative  
Reporte  
r  
The  
Intercep  
t  
mobile/  
signal  
718-  
877-  
5236  
@fastler  
ner  
[https://t  
heinterc  
ept.com  
/staff/sh  
aronler  
ner/](https://theintercept.com/staff/sharonlerner/)

PGP:  
CB29  
D9FF  
9285  
3205  
087E 83  
A1 0C30  
2F39  
4F30  
8BFE